

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: CCMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20201 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/600,134	09/11/2000	Gerard Lang	05725.0654	8900	
75	90 03/06/2003	•	•		
Finnegan Henderson Farabow Garrett & Dunner 1300 I Street NW			EXAMINER		
			ELHILO, EISA B		
Washington, DO	20005		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
			1751	22	
			DATE MAILED: 03/06/2003	DATE MAILED: 03/06/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			-1/10
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/600,134	LANG ET AL.	
navioury neuton	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Eisa B Elhilo	1751	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	lress
THE REPLY FILED 10 February 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avifinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application a timely filed amendment whic	ation. A proper repl h places the applica	y to a ation in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejecti	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officitimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The apporting originally set in the final	ropriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a)   they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
<ul><li>(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or si	mplifying the
<ul><li>(d) they present additional claims without canceli NOTE:</li></ul>	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claim	S.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Sec		idered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which wer	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	· · · —		and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: <i>None</i> .			
Claim(s) objected to: None.			
Claim(s) rejected: 22-58.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. $\square$ The proposed drawing correction filed on $\_\_\_$ is	a) approved or b) disapp	proved by the Exami	iner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
10. Other:			

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant has not presented any additional data or showing to overcome the rejection of record. The arguments presented on paper No. 21, dated 2/10/2003 merely rehash the arguments presented earlier which were fully responded by the examiner in previous office action on paper No. 20, dated 10/8/2002...

(YOGENDRA N. GUPTA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700**